

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15-20, 22, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 35-37, 39, 42-44, 46 and 49 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 15-18 are independent claims. By this Amendment, claims 7, 8, 14, 21, 24, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41, 45, 47 and 48 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15-20, 22, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 35-39, 42-44, 46 and 49 are amended. No new matter is added.

**Information Disclosure Statements**

Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of receipt and consideration of the references submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 9, 2008, July 29, 2008 and August 29, 2008.

**Objection to the Specification**

Claims 20, 23, 30, 37 and 44 are objected to for allegedly reciting subject matter not supported in the specification. Specifically, it is alleged that the specification fails to provide support for the "first navigation information does not provide presentation information."

As the claims are amended to overcome the objection, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 24, 31, 38 and 45 are objected to for allegedly reciting subject matter not supported in the specification. Specifically, it is alleged that the

specification fails to provide support for the “first navigation information does not provide navigation information for both still images and audio data.”

As claims 21, 24, 31, 38 and 45 are cancelled, the rejection is moot.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,385,389 to Maruyama, et al. (Maruyama). As claims 2-5, 10, 11 and 13 were previously cancelled and claim 14 is presently cancelled, the rejection of those claims is moot. The rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 12 and 15-18 is respectfully traversed.

Maruyama fails to disclose or suggest, a computer readable medium having a data structure for managing reproduction of at least still images recorded on the computer readable medium, comprising... a playlist area storing at least one playlist file, the playlist file linking the first and second stream files and including at least a playitem and a sub-playitem, the playitem...the playitem includes an indicator indicating whether to display the still image for one of a finite and an infinite period of time, and progress of the slideshow from one still image to another still image is controlled by user input and presentation of the audio data occurs independently of presentation of the still image, if the indicator indicates to display the still image for an infinite period, as recited in amended independent claim 1, or the similar features of amended independent claim 15-18.

Moreover, Maruyama also fails to disclose or suggest, “a data area storing

at least one still image in a first stream file and audio data in a second stream file; and a playlist area storing at least one playlist file, the playlist file linking the first and second stream files and including at least a playitem and a sub-playitem, the playitem, providing presentation information regarding the still image in the first stream file, and the sub-playitem providing presentation information regarding audio data in the second stream file,” as recited in independent claim 1, or the similar features recited in independent claims 15-18.

In Maruyama, a video title set program chain information table (VTS\_PGCIT) controls the cell for presentation of data and the video object units 85 (VOBU) in the cell are controlled by navigation pack NV\_pack 86. Thus, Maruyama requires the VTS\_PGCIT and the NV\_pack for the presentation of data. As may be seen in Fig. 16 of Maruyama, the VTS\_PGCIT is included in the video title set information (VTSI) and the NV\_pack is included in the video object set for video title set title (VTSTT\_VOBS). Therefore, Maruyama needs both the information area and the data area for the presentation of data. As such, Maruyama fails to disclose or suggest, “providing presentation information regarding the still image in the first stream file, and the sub-playitem providing presentation information regarding audio data in the second stream file.”

Further, the Examiner asserts at page 3 of the current Office Action that Maruyama discloses at FIG. 13 and col. 15, lines 31+ a playlist including navigation information providing presentation information regarding

the first and second files. Specifically the Examiner alleges that the VOB 85 corresponds to the claimed "first stream file" and the NV\_pack corresponds to the claimed "first navigation information." The Examiner further alleges that the pack in the VOB 85 corresponds to the claimed "second stream file" and the NV\_pack corresponds to the claimed "second navigation information."

Maruyama discloses at col. 15, lines 31-38 that "FIG. 13 shows PCI packet 116 included in navigation pack 86 located at the beginning of each VOB 85. As shown in FIG. 13, PCI packet 116 includes presentation control information PCI (PCI data) 113 as navigation data used for changing the display or playback contents (presentation contents) in synchronism with the playback state of video data in video object unit (VOB) 85. Therefore, the presentation control information in Maruyama is included in the navigation pack 86 which is included in the VOB 85 with the video and audio data.

Thus, in Maruyama, the pack may contain the video pack, sub-picture pack and audio pack. The NV\_pack provides the presentation information of the pack data (the presentation information of every pack of the VOB). In contrast to Maruyama which does not disclose the attributes of the packs, the rejected claims describe a "stream file" for the audio data and a "stream file" for a still picture with a playitem for the presentation of the stream files for the still picture and a sub-playitem for the presentation of the stream file for the audio data.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable for at least the above reasons. Further, Applicants submit that

claims 15-18 include features somewhat similar to those discussed above in regards to amended claim 1, and therefore, claims 15-18 are patentable for at least somewhat similar reasons as claim 1. Applicants also respectfully submit that claims 6-9 and 12, which depend from amended claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regards to amended claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, 30, 31, 37, 38, 44 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruyama. As claims 21, 24, 31, 38 and 45 are cancelled, the rejection of those claims is moot. The rejection of claims 20, 23, 30, 37 and 44 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20, 23, 30, 37 and 44 are allowable for their dependency on their respective base claim, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully traversed.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John W. Fitzpatrick, 41,018

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

GDY/JWF